APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,861	10/22/2001	Hawley K. Rising III	080398.P432	1947

8791   7590   03/07/2007
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/044,861	RISING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _04 December 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-28_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This **FINAL** action is responsive to the amendment filed on December 4, 2006.

2.   Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22 and 26-28 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth

in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to
> a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello (NPL---How an

XML Instance Document References an XML Schema, Jan 2000) in view of Villard (NPL---An Xml-based multimedia

document processing model for content adaptation, Sep 2000) further in view of Hunter (NPL—Multimedia Content

Description Interface, May 2000).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 8 & 11, Costello discloses *a computerized method of encoding*

multimedia content descriptions for a specific application domain comprising: obtaining an instance

document (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg 2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3 paragraphs 1-7, wherein Costello explicitly

describes the use of an instance document with a schema including the declaration of namespaces for the

elements). Costello fails to explicitly teach the mapping of the namespace using XSTL. Villard teaches

transforming the instance document from the general application domain to the specific application domain

by mapping from a general application namespace to a specific application namespace <u>*wherein the specific*</u>

<u>*application domain supports fewer multimedia description elements than the general application domain*</u>

(section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces

described by Costello. The purpose of the XSLT in general is to convert in a specific format for a specific

device therefore it includes mapping the namespace elements from a general to a specific. Namespaces are

used to differentiate and identify elements used in multiple documents, for example package for a home

element may differ from package for the office element. Further Hunter describes the validation of xml

documents including using namespaces, see pg 3, paragraph 1. Hunter shows the validation of the

multimedia content descriptors using an XML schema with a general namespace prior to using a XSLT to

convert the namespace to a specific format has described by Villard on pg 7, paragraph 3). Villard fails to explicitly teach the descriptors of the multimedia content. Hunter discloses *that encodes the descriptions of multimedia content for a general application domain* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1, wherein Hunter describes the use of descriptions for multimedia content in a general application domain using the XML Schema language with MPEG-7); Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 2, 9 & 12, Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the instance document. Hunter discloses *creating a binary instance document from the transformed instance document* (foreword, part 2, wherein the description definition language includes the binary representation of the DDL expressions). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 3, 10 &13, Costello fails to teach a frequency table. Hunter discloses

deriving a frequency table from the specific application namespace (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword,

part 2, wherein a table for recording the frequency of the descriptors from the specific namespace is

derived); *and using the frequency table to encode the binary instance document* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 &

6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein encoding includes the use of the DDL encoder which converts the instance

document into a binary instance document using the frequency of the descriptors). Costello explicitly

teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify

a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations.

Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the

time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia

content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so

would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes

that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine

the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a

specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 4, with dependency of claim 1, Costello discloses *wherein the specific*

application namespace includes elements in the general application namespace (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg

2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3 paragraphs 1-7, wherein the elements in the specific namespace includes

elements in the general namespace).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 1, Costello fails to teach data description

language. Hunter discloses *wherein the general application namespace is defined by a data description*

language specified by MPEG-7 (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein a data description

language including MPEG-7 is used to define the general application namespace). Costello explicitly

teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify

a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations.

Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the

time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia

content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so

would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claim 6, with dependency of claim 1, Costello fails to teach data description language. Hunter discloses *wherein the specific application namespace is defined by an application specific description language* (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein the specific namespace is defined by an application specific description language).

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 1, Costello fails to explicitly teach the mapping of the namespace using XSTL. Villard teaches *wherein the mapping is defined in an extensible markup language style-sheet translation document* (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

5.   Claims 14-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello (NPL—How an XML Instance Document References an XML Schema, Jan 2000) in view of Hunter (NPL—Multimedia Content Description Interface, May 2000) further in view of Villard (NPL—An Xml-based multimedia document processing model for content adaptation, Sep 2000).

Regarding Independent claim 14, 18 & 22, Costello discloses *creating, by the server, a binary instance document from the transformed instance document* (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg 2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3

paragraphs 1-7, wherein Costello explicitly describes the use of an instance document with a schema

including the declaration of namespaces for the elements); Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the

instance document. Hunter teaches the creation of a binary instance document from a transformed instance

document (foreword, part 2, wherein the description definition language includes the binary representation of

the DDL expressions). Hunter discloses *transforming, by a server, an instance document from a general*

application domain to the specific application domain, wherein the instance document encodes the

descriptions of multimedia content in the general application domain, and wherein the specific application

domain supports fewer multimedia description elements than the general application domain (section 0.1,

5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1, wherein Hunter describes the use of descriptions for multimedia content in a general

application domain using the XML Schema language with MPEG-7. Hunter teaches in section 4, wherein

XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by

Costello. The purpose of the XSLT in general is to convert in a specific format for a specific device therefore

it includes mapping the namespace elements from a general to a specific. Namespaces are used to

differentiate and identify elements used in multiple documents, for example package for a home element

may differ from package for the office element. Further Hunter describes the validation of xml documents

including using namespaces, see pg 3, paragraph 1. Hunter shows the validation of the multimedia content

descriptors using an XML schema with a general namespace prior to using a XSLT to convert the

namespace to a specific format has described by Villard on pg 7, paragraph 3). Hunter fails to describe the

transformation of the instance document. Villard teaches the transformation of the instance document from a

general domain to a specific domain (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and

perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Villard discloses *transmitting, by the server,*

the binary instance document to the client upon request from the client (sections 1 & 6 & fig 5, wherein the

document is transmitted to a client upon a request). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance

document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard

teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an

XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a

general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a

simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from

multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Villard,

Hunter and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 15, 21 & 25, Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the instance document. Hunter teaches the creation of a binary instance document from a transformed instance document (foreword, part 2, wherein the description definition language includes the binary representation of the DDL expressions). Villard discloses *receiving, by the client, the binary instance document from the server* (sections 1 & 6 & fig 5, wherein the document is transmitted to a client upon a request from a server); *and recreating, by the client, the transformed instance document from the binary instance document* (sections 1 & 6 & fig 5, wherein the document is transmitted and recreated by the client). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Villard, Hunter and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claims 16, 19 & 23, Costello fails to explicitly teach the mapping of the namespace using XSTL. Villard teaches *wherein transforming the instance document comprises: mapping from a general application namespace to a specific application namespace* (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and

description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have

been obvious to combine the teachings of Villard, Hunter and Costello for the benefits of encoding

multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from

multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, 20 & 24, Costello fails to teach a frequency table. Hunter discloses

deriving, by the server, a frequency table from the specific application namespace (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 &

6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein a table for recording the frequency of the descriptors from the specific

namespace is derived); *and using, by the server, the frequency table to encode the binary instance*

document (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1 & foreword, part 2, wherein encoding includes the use of the DDL

encoder which converts the instance document into a binary instance document using the frequency of the

descriptors). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces

with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content

using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including

descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a

specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying

names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the

benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including

schemas from multiple different namespaces.

Regarding Independent claims 26-28, Costello discloses *receiving, by the client, a binary instance*

document (pg 1, paragraphs 5-8 & pg 2, paragraphs 2-9 & pg 3 paragraphs 1-7, wherein Costello explicitly

describes the use of an instance document with a schema including the declaration of namespaces for the

elements); Costello fails to disclose the binarization of the instance document. Hunter teaches the creation

of a binary instance document from a transformed instance document (foreword, part 2, wherein the

description definition language includes the binary representation of the DDL expressions). Hunter discloses

recreating, by the client, a transformed instance document from the binary instance document, wherein the

transformed instance document encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in the specific application

domain as a result of transforming an instance document that encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in a general application domain, and wherein the specific application domain supports fewer multimedia description elements than the general application domain (section 0.1, 5.1, 5.2.1 & 6.1, wherein Hunter describes the use of descriptions for multimedia content in a general application domain using the XML Schema language with MPEG-7. Hunter teaches in section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello. The purpose of the XSLT in general is to convert in a specific format for a specific device therefore it includes mapping the namespace elements from a general to a specific. Namespaces are used to differentiate and identify elements used in multiple documents, for example package for a home element may differ from package for the office element. Further Hunter describes the validation of xml documents including using namespaces, see pg 3, paragraph 1. Hunter shows the validation of the multimedia content descriptors using an XML schema with a general namespace prior to using a XSLT to convert the namespace to a specific format has described by Villard on pg 7, paragraph 3). Hunter fails to describe the transformation of the instance document. Villard teaches the transformation of the instance document from a general domain to a specific domain (section 4, wherein XSLT is used to transform the document and perform the mapping of the namespaces described by Costello). Costello explicitly teaches the use of an instance document including the use of namespaces with an XML Schema to identify a target namespace. Villard teaches the adaptation of multimedia content using XSLT transformations. Hunter discloses the use of an XML Schema with multimedia including descriptors defined using DDL. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to encode multimedia content descriptions for a general application domain to a specific domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a simple method for qualifying names of descriptors and description schemes that include schemas from multiple different namespaces. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Hunter, Villard and Costello for the benefits of encoding multimedia descriptions for a specific domain allowing content adaptation by including schemas from multiple different namespaces.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]].

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicants Arguments filed December 4, 2006 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues: Applicant respectfully submits that the word "namespace" is a term of art, and that Villard does not actually disclose that either the generic or specific transformation maps between namespaces as the term is defined in the art. (See pg 8, paragraph 4).

Thus, the mere fact that Villard transforms an XML document into a multimedia document is insufficient evidence that Villard transforms the document by mapping between different namespaces as claimed by Applicant (See pg 9, paragraph 1).

However the Examiner respectfully disagrees: The above argument does not take into account the references used in a combination to teach the claimed elements, instead the Villard reference is isolated and relied upon by applicant to teach the claim. Further applicant states that "Accordingly, it appears that the Examiner is relying on the principal of inherency" (see pg 8, paragraph 4). The Examiner is using a combination of references to describe the mapping of namespaces, not relying on inherency. Applicant is reminded:

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The claims describe the process of mapping a general application namespace to a target application namespace. By definition a namespace used has " **a term of art**":

(Google define: namespace-----a closed set of names or a place where a schema (set of names) is stored. Namespaces are identified via a URI (for example, a URL) and are a mechanism to resolve naming conflicts. Within a given namespace all names must be unique, although the same name may be used with a different meaning in a different namespace.)

Costello teaches the referencing between an instance XML document and a schema used to validate the document (See pg 1, paragraph 1). Costello explicitly describes the use of Namespaces has defined and mapped between an instance document and a schema. For example: <Person xmlns:l="urn:last-name-schema"> maps to <{urn:last-name-schema} Person> according to the reference cited which is common knowledge to one of ordinary skill (See Clark, XML Namespaces, pgs 2 of 4 paragraphs 3-5). Further using the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, Person is the general form but becomes specific once you map the last-name namespace to the element. This simple process is the mapping of namespaces from a general to a specific description, because now the person is identified by the last name, the last name represents the Universal Recourse Identifier for the Person element, which can be used for multiple names. However according to the combination of references, Costello describes the validation of the instance document against a schema, this validation includes mapping in its own has described above. One of ordinary skill would understand that mapping from a general to a specific format typically includes the use of a stylesheet XSLT, because a stylesheet transforms a general description (XML instance document) to a specific description (defined in an XSLT) tailored to a specific device.

However the elements and descriptors described in the claim are used for processing multimedia content. Villard describes the use of a XSLT to transform multimedia content for specific devices (See page 1, introduction & pg 7, transformation section). Although he doesn't explicitly state namespaces instead he uses **many identifiers for differentiating the same element** by using different ID's [see pg 4 for example: DefContent element is differentiated by 2 identifiers SlideTitle1 and SildeTitle 2], according to the definition above it is implied that namespaces are used.

Hunter explicitly teaches the use of Namespaces for validation of content similar to Costello but for multimedia descriptors (See pg 1, section 1). Further namespaces are used throughout the reference, see pg 3 for example where Hunter shows <schema xmlns=http://www.w3.org/1999/XMLSchema>, where xmlns stands for XML name space. The three teachings described above when used in combination describe validation of multimedia descriptors that include general namespaces being mapped to a specific namespace by transformation using an XSLT that includes specific namespaces. This would allow multimedia content to be adaptable on limited display devices, because content descriptors are transformed

from a general to a specific format for the specific device. Furthermore the stylesheet itself would not be able to differentiate the similar elements or descriptors of the multimedia content without using namespaces, this is why Villard shows that similar elements are differentiated using the Identifiers which by definition are namespaces.

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

*   Kaler et al. (U.S. 6,993,714) discloses "Grouping And Nesting Hierarchical Namespaces"

*   Clark, James NPL---XML Namespaces, 1999, pgs 1-4

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information

Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or

Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
February 28, 2007

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY   'IER